

創価大学  
国際仏教学高等研究所  
年報

平成12年度  
(第4号)

Annual Report  
of  
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
at Soka University  
for the Academic Year 2000

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所  
東京・2001・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
Soka University  
Tokyo・2001

## **The Sanskrit *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra* fragment in the Mannerheim collection (Helsinki)**

Klaus WILLE

The journey by the Finnish Baron Carl Gustaf Emil Mannerheim (1867–1951) through Central Asia and the northern provinces of China lasted almost two years from 29th of July 1906 to 20th of July 1908. Being a cavalry officer in imperial service C.G. Mannerheim was chosen by the Russian General Staff to obtain geographical and military information about the Chinese borderlands.<sup>1</sup> To cover up his mission he had to join the members of the Pelliot expedition. But he parted company with them already in Kashgar and travelled via Yarkand to Khotan on the southern Silk Road. From there he went back to Kashgar and then along the northern Silk Road via Kuldja, Qarašahr, Urumči, Turfan, Hami, and Ansi to Dunhuang and further on until he finally reached Beijing.<sup>2</sup>

Interested in scientific studies, Mannerheim got in contact with Otto Donner, then the President of the Finno-Ugrian Society. As a result funds were obtained from the Finno-Ugrian Society, and also the Trustees of the Antell Fund put aside funds to purchase from Mannerheim expected archaeological and ethnographical material as well as manuscripts for the State Historical Museum, later renamed the National Museum.

Reading through Mannerheim's "Records of the journey" one comes across only a few references to his own archaeological excavations<sup>3</sup> or investigations<sup>4</sup>. The yield of antiquities, however, was rather poor. He found bones, pieces of clay vessels, and large clay jars, but not a single manuscript and only occasionally he

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Mannerheim 1940, vol. I, preface; Aalto 1971: 113; Aalto 1981: 6; Sandberg 1990: 7; Lahdentausta *et al.* 1999: 7 f.; Varjola 1999: 64 ff.; Ratia 2000: 1.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the map in Mannerheim 1940, vol. I [reprint in Ratia 2000], Sandberg 1990, and the exhibition catalogue of the Museum of Cultures (cf. note 5).

<sup>3</sup> Mannerheim 1940, vol. I (Mannerheim wrote his diary originally in Swedish. According to Halén 1999: 50, the English version is not always accurate); pp. 130 ff.: 12th to 13th February 1907 (Kelpin village), pp. 220 f.: 30th April 1907 (Kuldja).

<sup>4</sup> Mannerheim 1940, vol. I; p. 292: 11th July 1907 (Qarašahr), p. 350: 25th September 1907 (Yarxoto), pp. 359 f.: 30th September (Idikutšähri and Astana), p. 360: 1st October (Murtuq and Sängim Ayız), pp. 361 f.: 2nd October (Toyoq), p. 365: 5th October (Čiktim).

mentions the purchase of archaeological and ethnographical material as well.<sup>5</sup> Concerning manuscript fragments he just refers to his largest acquisition from local inhabitants in the Turfan oasis.<sup>6</sup> These fragments are supposed to be found in Yārḡoto, Idiqutšähri, and Čiktim. Among these purchases Chinese fragments are by far the majority, viz. about 2000 fragments.<sup>7</sup> Some of them have texts in Tibetan or Uigur on the verso and one has some Brāhmī characters on the verso.<sup>8</sup> Next in number are the Uigur fragments, some of which have Chinese text on one side.<sup>9</sup> Besides these there are some Middle Iranian fragments in Sogdian script,<sup>10</sup> one Mongolian fragment in 'Phags-pa script,<sup>11</sup> and one so-called *täzkirä* document in Eastern Turki.<sup>12</sup>

During his stay in Khotan and its vicinity from 29 November till 10 December 1906 Mannerheim bought with the help of Badruddīn Khān,<sup>13</sup> the Aksakal of Indian and Afghan traders in Khotan, besides some antiquities also eight so-called *täzkirä* documents in Eastern Turki from local inhabitants.<sup>14</sup> In his "Records of the journey" he does not mention any other purchase of further manuscripts. Never-

---

<sup>5</sup> The most recent survey is found in the exhibition catalogue of the Museum of Cultures: *C. G. Mannerheim in Central Asia 1906–1908*, Helsinki 1999. The Museum of Cultures is a part of the National Museum of Finland.

<sup>6</sup> Mannerheim 1940, vol. I, p. 350: 25th September 1907 (Turfan), p. 365: 5th October (Čiktim); in this context Mannerheim states (p. 350): "It is more difficult, however, to secure ancient objects here than at Khotan and the prices are considerably higher"; cf. also Halén 1999: 47 f. and Halén 1999 a: 59.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Halén 1978: 118 ff. (no. 461); for the identification of some of the fragments see Halén 1999: 48 f.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Halén 1978: 119 f. [nos. 461:29 (= p. 100, no. 345), 461:33, 461:34 (= p. 71, no. 214), and 461:147].

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Halén 1978: 99 f. (nos. 344–346).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Sims-Williams/Halén 1980 and Halén 1999: 49.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Halén 1978: 11 (no. 2), Halén 1999: 49.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Halén 1978: 101 (no. 351).

<sup>13</sup> Badruddīn Khān also sold many manuscript fragments to the British consul general Sir George Macartney in Kashgar, to S. H. Godfrey during his stay in Leh between 1895–98, to Sir Aurel Stein during his stay in Khotan on his three expeditions between 1901 and 1916, to Albert von Le Coq during his stay in Kashgar in December 1913, and to August Hermann Francke and Hans Körber during their stay in Khotan in August 1914.

<sup>14</sup> Mannerheim 1940, vol. I: 89 ff.; for the *täzkirä* documents see Halén 1978: 100 f. (no. 350) and Halén 1999 a: 54 f.

theless, there are altogether eleven fragments<sup>15</sup> in Brāhmī script which were acquired by Mannerheim in the Khotan region and then handed over to J.N. Reuter for edition.<sup>16</sup> At that time it was not possible for Reuter to say anything definite about the find-spots of the fragments:<sup>17</sup>

“It is an unfortunate circumstance that the locality where these Mannerheim fragments, as I propose to call them, were found or acquired by purchase cannot be determined. The objects sent home by Baron Mannerheim were accompanied by notes giving the find-place and other data, but when the present fragments were handed over to me for inspection, no such notes, with one exception, came into my hands. The necessary data might, however, have been easily supplied from Baron Mannerheim’s notes, then in the possession of Senator Donner, had not the unexpected death of this distinguished scholar and ardent promoter of Oriental, and especially Ural-Altaic research, made the identification of the notes impossible.

I am not even quite certain to what fragment the exception mentioned above has reference; but to the best of my recollection, it is to fragment 6. It was found, together with one coin and three button-like ornaments, in the sand, from which the top-most layer had been blown away, at Hangi (in some maps called Yangi) six stations South of Khotan.”

The find-spot of six other fragments is Khādaliq near the oasis of Domoko (Dumaqu), about 115 km east of Khotan.<sup>18</sup> Since 1971 the fragments are housed in the Helsinki University Library as a deposit of the Finno-Ugrian Society.

Among the eleven fragments, fragment 10 is a Sanskrit-Khotanese bilingual, whereas fragment 11 is in Khotanese only and was identified by Sten Konow<sup>19</sup> as belonging to the *Śaṅghāṭasūtra*. The texts of fragments 1–9 are in Sanskrit: fragment 3 belongs to the *Kāśyapaparivarta* (identified by J.W. de Jong<sup>20</sup>), fragment 5 to the *Saddharmapūṇḍarīkasūtra* (identified by J.N. Reuter), fragment 6 to the *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra* (identified by J.N. Reuter), fragment 7 and 8 belong to two

---

<sup>15</sup> In a letter from Kashgar to Otto Donner Mannerheim speaks of only seven fragments (cf. Halén 1999 a: 54). Besides these, Mannerheim must have bought also some forged documents (cf. Halén 1978: 123, no. 473).

<sup>16</sup> Reuter 1918; according to Halén 1978: 71 (no. 213), a short survey of the fragments is found in Donner 1934: 70–71, illustrations between pp. 40 and 41.

<sup>17</sup> Reuter 1918: 1 f.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Halén 1999: 47 and Halén 1999 a: 54.

<sup>19</sup> To the same folio belongs the fragment Hoernle 147 NS 112 in the Oriental and India Office Collections (British Library, London); cf. Canevascini 1993: 250 f.

<sup>20</sup> To the same folio belong the fragments Hoernle 143 S.B. 38 and Hoernle 143 S.B. 39 in the Oriental and India Office Collections (British Library, London); cf. de Jong 1977.

different manuscripts of the *Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (identified by J.N. Reuter)<sup>21</sup>. Attached to Reuter's edition are the complete facsimiles of fragments 1, 6, 10, 11, complete facsimile of only the reverse of fragment 4, only specimen of fragments 7–9. For fragments 2, 3, and 5 no facsimiles are given. Most regrettably there is neither a facsimile of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* fragment nor a transliteration of the text. During my recent work on several Central Asian Sanskrit fragments of different manuscripts of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* I found the reference to that Mannerheim fragment in several surveys of extant fragments and decided to give a transliteration of it. Looking at the photos of the original I can only admire Reuter's skilfulness in reading the due to abrasion almost illegible script and identifying the text more than eighty years ago.

Description and identification by J.N. Reuter:<sup>22</sup>

“*Fragment 5.* (Not figured) Length about 8 1/2 in.; breadth 3 1/8 in.; about one third of the right-hand side torn away; string-hole 3 1/8 in. from left-hand edge. Paper light yellow, thin, even texture, longitudinal waterlines. Script very good, but so worn as to make it almost illegible, especially on obverse. Six lines on each page.

This is a fragment from the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, printed text p. 40<sup>16</sup> to 41<sup>14</sup>, beginning thus: *dikṣv=aprameyāsv=asaṃkhyeyāsu lokadhātuṣu* etc., and ending: *viditvā dharmaṃ de[śayiṣyanti]*. The reading of the fragment, as far as it [is] possible to decipher it, appears to differ but slightly from the edition. In the fragment *lokadhātu* is fem.; for Śāriputra the fragment has *Śāradvatīputra*, for *samādāpanam* : *samādapanam*, for *nānādhātvo* : *anekadhātvo*; *saddharmaḥ* is written *sadharmaḥ*; in the phrase *sattvānāṃ dharmaṃ deśitavantaḥ* the fragment leaves out *dharmaṃ*.”

One may add that the blank space for the punch hole lies in the third and fourth line and is marked by a circle. According to an information by Marja-Leena Hänninen, who also supplied the photos, there is some thin protecting paper on the recto of the original.<sup>23</sup> The foliation number is illegible. The script is the South Turkestan

<sup>21</sup> For a parallel to fragment 8 *recto*, line 1–7, see *Abisamayālamkāraloka Prajñāpāramitā-vyākhyā*, *The work of Haribhadra, together with the text commented on*, ed. U. Wogihara, Tokyo 1932 (repr. 1973), pp. 159.22 ff.

<sup>22</sup> Reuter 1918: 7.

<sup>23</sup> The same procedure has been applied to the Uigur and Chinese fragments; cf. Halén 1978: 99 (no. 344), and p. 118 (no. 461), and Sims-Williams/Halén 1980: 3 (“... the fragments had been preliminarily restored and attached to thin sheets of rice paper or between them.”).

Brāhmī (main type).<sup>24</sup> For the diacritic sign *-e* both the “Indian” *-e* and the “Central Asian” *-e* are written. Once the superscribed Khotanese “*r*” is found.

It is not easy to assign the text of the fragment to one of the recensions of the *Saddharmapundarīka*.<sup>25</sup> For comparison we have evidence of only two other Central Asian manuscripts, namely the so-called Kashgar manuscript and one of the Lüshun manuscripts. The text of our fragment definitely differs in many cases from the text of the so-called Kashgar manuscript. Of the corresponding fragment of the Lüshun manuscript A, which belongs to group I, only scraps of some words are extant.<sup>26</sup> Our fragment seems to belong to the Gilgit/Nepal or Gilgit/Khotan/Nepal recension (group III).<sup>27</sup> The reading *śāradvatīputra* instead of *śāriputra* (line v1) is found only in the Gilgit manuscripts, whereas the readings *samādāpana* instead of *samādāpana* (line r6) and *anekadhātuvāśaya* (lines r4 and v6) are found only in the so-called Kashgar manuscript.

The text of our fragment covers the following passage in the KN edition (KN 40.15–41.14):

ye 'pi te śāriputrātīte 'dhvany abhūvan daśasu di(r1)kṣv aprameyeṣv asaṃkhyeyeṣu  
lokadhātuṣu tathāgatā arhantaḥ samyaksambuddhā bahujanahitāya bahujanasu-  
(r2)khāya lokānukampāyai mahato janakāyasyārthāya hitāya sukhāya devānāṃ ca  
manuṣyānāṃ ca | ye (r3) nānābhīnirhāranirdeśavividhahetukāraṇanidarśanāramba-  
ṇaniruktyupāyakauśalyair nānādhimuktānāṃ sattvā(r4)nāṃ nānādhātuvāśayānāṃ  
āśayaṃ viditvā dharmam deśitavantaḥ | te 'pi sarve śāriputra buddhā bhagavanta

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Sander 1968, alphabet v.

<sup>25</sup> H. Toda [Saddhp(C): lv–lviii] established the following groups of Central Asian manuscripts: 1. The Khotan recension: 1 a. The so-called Kashgar manuscript represents the most complete manuscript of this text. 1 b. The Farhād-Bēg manuscript is very similar to the Kashgar manuscript, the Devadatta portion, however, is not included, neither as a part of the eleventh chapter nor as a separate twelfth chapter. 1 c. Manuscripts which mainly agree with the Kashgar manuscript (group II of Toda). 1 d. Manuscripts which are much older and generally shorter than the Kashgar manuscript (group I of Toda). 2. Manuscripts which are very similar to the Gilgit/Nepal recension (group III of Toda).

<sup>26</sup> Cf. note 35.

<sup>27</sup> According to Toda 1984: 211, the twelf palm-leaf manuscripts from Nepal can be classified into three groups: Group I. C3, C4 (fols. 1–107, 118–140), K, N1; Group II. C5, C6 (fols. 76–78, 83–131); Group III. T2, T6, C4 (fols. 108–117), C6 (fols. 1–75, 79–82), B, T7, N2, N3. He further pointed to the similarity of the Gilgit manuscripts with the group I of this subdivision, and assigned the palm-leaf manuscript from Beijing to this group I (cf. Toda 1985: 245). For the classification of the paper manuscripts into eight or nine groups see Toda 1998 and 1997 respectively. However, our fragment cannot be assigned to one of these subdivisions.

ekam e(r5)va yānam ārabhya sattvānām dharmam deśitavanto yad idaṃ buddhayā-  
nam sarvajñatāparyavasānam yad idaṃ tathāgata(r6)jñānadarśanasamādāpanam eva  
sattvānām tathāgatajñānadarśanasamdarśanam eva tathāgatajñānadarśanāvatāraṇam  
eva tathāgatajñānadarśanapratibodhanam eva tathāgatajñānadarśanamārgāvatā-  
ra(v1)ṇam eva sattvānām dharmam deśitavantaḥ | yair api śāriputra sattvais teṣām  
atītānām tathāgatānām arhatām samyaksambuddhānā(v2)m antikāt saddharmah  
śrutas te 'pi sarve 'nuttarāyāḥ samyaksambodher lābhino 'bhūvan\* ||

ye 'pi te śāriputrānāgate 'dhvani (v3) bhaviṣyanti daśasu dikṣv aprameyeṣv  
asaṃkhyeṣu lokadhātuṣu tathāgatā arhantaḥ samyaksambuddhā bahujaṇa(v4)hitāya  
bahujanasukhāya lokānukampāyai mahato janakāyasyārthāya hitāya sukhā(v5)ya  
devānām ca manuṣyānām (ed. *manuṣmāṇām*) ca | ye ca nānābhīnirhāranirdeśavivi-  
dhahetukāraṇanidarśanārambaṇaniruktyupāya(v6)kauśalyair nānādhimuktānām  
sattvānām nānādhātvaśayānām āśayam viditvā dharmam deśayiṣyanti |

*Parallels:* Ka 47b5–49a1; Otani (Lüshun) SLLMC A-1 r1; KN 40.16–41.14;  
SMSR II-170–184; Toda 1999

*recto*

- 1 ... (m)[eyā] ... [yāsu<sup>28</sup> lok](a)dhā ... [th]āgatā[h] arhantaḥ samya-  
ksambuddhā [ba] .. + + + + + + + + +
- 2 .... (l)[o] ..... (p)[āyai] ..... [kāyasyārthāya] .. (t)[āya s]ukhāya (d)[e]  
+ + + + + + + + +
- 3 ... (bh)[i](n)[ir](h)[āra]nirdeśaviviO... [t]u ..... (n)[i]-  
(r)[ukt]yu[p]ā .. + + + + + + + + +
- 4 ... [neka](dh)[ā]tvāśayā[nā]<sup>29</sup>O.. [śay](am) ..... [va] .....  
[rve śā] + + + + + + + + +
- 5 .. [y]ā[na]m [ā]rabhyā satvā[nā](m) ..... [yā]na(m)  
sarvajñatā<sup>30</sup> + + + + + + + + +

<sup>28</sup> KN 40.16, SMSR II-170 (K, B, P1,2,3, T2,3,6,7, N2,3, D1), Ka 47b5: *aprameyeṣv asaṃkhyeṣu*; SMSR II-170 (C3,4,5, R, T4,5,8,9, A1,2,3): *aprameyaṣv asaṃkhyeṣu*; SMSR II-170 (N1): *aprameyāsaṃkhyeṣu*; SMSR II-170 (Pk, C1,2): *aprameyāsaṃkhyeṣu*. — For the sigla see SMSR; Pk in SMSR = Pe in Toda 1999.

<sup>29</sup> Ka 48a1 ff.: *nānādhimuktikānām satvānām nānādhātvaśayānām anekadhātvaśayānām satvānām dhātvaśayam viditvā yathādhātvaśayānām satvānām dharmam deśitavantas*; KN 41.3 f. and all other MSS: *nānādhimuktānām satvānām nānādhātvaśayānām* (v.l. °*āsayānām/nānāsa-tvā*°) *āśayam* (v.l. *āsayam*) *viditvā dharmam deśitavantaḥ* (v.l. *deśi*°).

<sup>30</sup> Ka 48a5: *sarvajñajñāna*°; KN 41.5 and all other MSS: *sarvajñatā*°.

6 .. [nadarśa] .. .. . panam<sup>31</sup> e[va satvā] .. .. .  
[nda]rśa[nāvatā]<sup>32</sup> .. + + + + + + + + + +

## verso

1 na[m]<sup>33</sup> eva satvānām deśitavanto<sup>34</sup> [yair a]pi [śā] .. [dva]tīp[u]tra<sup>35</sup> [sa-  
tvais<sup>36</sup> teṣām a]tītānān<sup>37</sup> tathā + + + + + + + + + +  
2 [m anti]kāt sa dharmah<sup>38</sup> [śr]utas te 'pi .. [rve] .. tta .. (y)[ās<sup>39</sup>  
sa]mya[ksa](m)bodherra lābhino 'bhūvan\*<sup>40</sup> [y]e + + + + + + + + + +  
3 bhaviṣyanti [daśa]s[u]<sup>41</sup> dikṣv aprameO[yāsv<sup>42</sup> a] .. .. [y]ā[su l]oka(dh)[āt](u)-  
[ṣu tath]āgatā + + + + + + + + + +  
4 (h)[i](t)[ā] .. bahu[ja]nasuO[kh]āya [lo]kānu[ka](m)p(ā)yai [maha]to janak[ā] +  
+ + + + + + + + + +

<sup>31</sup> J.N. Reuter still could read: *samādapanam*; Ka 48 a 5 too has: °*samādapanam*; KN 41.5 and all other MSS: °*samādāpanam* [except SMSR II-175 (C 1,2): °*samādāyanam*].

<sup>32</sup> Cf. KN 41.5–7: *eva sattvānām tathāgatajñānadarśanasamdarśanam* [so SMSR II-176 (C 1,4, P 3, T 7,8, A 3, N 1,2, D 1); SMSR II-176 (Pk, C 2,3,5, B, R, P 1,2, T 2,3,5,6,9, A 1,2), Toda 1999 (T 8): *tathāgatajñānadarśanam*; Toda 1999 (T 7): *tathāgata(jñānadarśanam)*; Toda 1999 (K): °*darśanasamda(rśa)ntam*] *eva tathāgatajñānadarśanāvatāraṇam eva tathāgatajñānadarśanapratibodhanam* [e° t°*pratibodhanam* omitted in SMSR II-176 (C 3)] *eva tathāgatajñānadarśanamārgāvatāraṇam eva sattvānām*; Ka 48 a 5–7: *eva satvānām dharmam deśitavantas tathāgatajñānadarśanasamdarśanam eva tathāgatajñā(nadarśa)nāvatāraṇapratibodhanam eva tathāgatajñāna(darśana)mārgāvatāraṇam eva sattvānām*. As the gap between line r 6 and v 1 is too small for either of these readings, possibly restore to: *satvānām tathāgatajñānadarśanasamdarśanāvatāraṇapratibodhanamārgāvatāraṇam eva satvānām*.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. note 31.

<sup>34</sup> Except SMSR II-177 (C 6, B, T 3,6), Toda 1999 (T 7): *dharmam deśitavantaḥ*.

<sup>35</sup> Restore to *śāradvatīputra*; except SMSR II-177 (D 2) and Ka 48 a 7: *śāriputra* (v. l. *sāri*°).

<sup>36</sup> Otani (Lüshun) SLLMC A-1 r 1: /// pu[t]r(a) sarvv. .. ///.

<sup>37</sup> Ka 48 a 7–48 b 1: *satvās teṣām pūrvakānām*.

<sup>38</sup> KN 41.8, SMSR II-178 (Pk, C 1,2, B, R, T 4,5,9, A 2,3): *saddharmah*; SMSR II-178 (C 3, D 2), Ka 48 b 1: *sa dharmah*.

<sup>39</sup> KN 41.8 f., SMSR II-179 (K, C 3,4,5, B, R, P 1,2,3, T 2,3,6,7,8, A 1,2, N 1,2,3, D 1,2): *'nuttarāyāḥ*; SMSR II-179 (C 1,2, T 5,9, A 3), Toda 1999 (Pe), Ka 48 b 1 f.: *'nuttarāyām*.

<sup>40</sup> Ka 48 b 2: *babhūvu(h)*.

<sup>41</sup> Ka 48 b 2: *anāgate 'dhvani daśasu*.

<sup>42</sup> KN 41.10, SMSR II-180 (K, C 5,6, B, P 1,2,3, T 2,3,6,7,8 N 2): *aprameyeṣv asaṃkhyeyeṣu*; SMSR II-170 (Pk, C 1,2,3,4, R, T 4,5,9, A 1,2,3, N 1): *aprameyāsv asaṃkhyeyāsu*; SMSR II-170 (D 2): *aprameyāsaṃkhyeyāsu*; Ka 48 b 2: *aprameyeṣv asaṃkhyeyāsu*.



- 5 [ya] . . . (n)[ā](m) ca [ma]nuṣyānām ca ye<sup>43</sup> n[ā](n)[ā]bhinir(h)[ā] .. (n)i(rd)[e]  
 .. [v]ividhahetukāra[n](a)<sup>44</sup> + + + + + + + + + +  
 6 [kau] .. [l](y)[ai]r<sup>45</sup> [n]ānādhimuktānām satvā[n]ām ane[kadhā]<sup>46</sup> .. ..  
 yā(n)[ām] āśaya[m] vi(d)[itv]ā<sup>47</sup> dharmam de[ś](a) + + + + + + + + + +

### Symbols used in the transliteration

()	restored <i>akṣara</i>
[]	damaged <i>akṣara</i>
+	lost <i>akṣara</i>
..	illegible <i>akṣara</i>
	<i>daṇḍa</i>
.	punctuation mark for <i>visarga</i>
*	<i>virāma</i>
,	<i>avagraha</i> , not written in the MS
○	punch hole

### Abbreviations

Ka	so-called Kashgar manuscript of the <i>Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra</i> actually found in Khādaliq but purchased in Kashgar. Facsimile edition: <i>Saddharma-puṇḍarika-sūtra. Kashgar Manuscript</i> , ed. Lokesh Chandra with a foreword by Heinz Bechert, New Delhi 1976 (Śata-Piṭaka Series, 229) [repr. Tokyo 1977]. Transliteration in Saddhp(C), pp. 3–225.
KN	<i>Saddharmapuṇḍarika</i> , ed. H. Kern and Bunyiu Nanjio, St.-Petersbourg [1908–]1912 (Bibliotheca Buddhica, 10).
Saddhp(C)	<i>Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra. Central Asian Manuscripts. Romanized Text</i> , ed. Hirofumi Toda, Tokushima <sup>2</sup> 1983.

<sup>43</sup> KN 41.12, SMSR II-182 (R, T9, A 2,3): *ye ca*; SMSR II-182 (K, Pk, C 1,2,3,4,5, B, P 1,2,3, T2,3,4,5,6,7,8, A 1, N 1,2,3, D 1,2): *ye*; Ka 48b 5: *yair*.

<sup>44</sup> Ka 48b 5: *nānābhinirhāranānirdeśa°*.

<sup>45</sup> Ka 48b 6: *°kośalyebhi* °; all other MSS: *°kauśalyair* (v.l. *°lyaiḥ/°lyai/°lye/°lyesa/°kuśalair*).

<sup>46</sup> Ka 48b 6 ff.: *nānādhātvaśayānām anekadhātvaśayānām satvānām dhātvaśayaṃ viditvā yathādhātvaśayānām satvānām dharmam deśayisyanti*; KN 41.13 f. and all other MSS: *nānādhātvaśayānām* (v.l. *°āsayānām*) *āśayaṃ* (v.l. *āsayam*) *viditvā dharmam deśayisyanti* (v.l. *desa°/deśayanti*).

<sup>47</sup> MS: *vidhitvā?*

- SLLMC      *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Fragments from the Lushun Museum Collection, Facsimile Edition and Romanized Text*, ed. Zhongxin Jiang, Dalian and Tokyo 1997.
- SMSR      *Sanskrit manuscripts of Saddharmapundarika. Collected from Nepal, Kashmir and Central Asia. Romanized Text and Index*, ed. Keishō Tsukamoto, Ryūgen Taga, Ryōjun Mitomo and Moriichi Yamazaki, vols. I–II, Tokyo 1986–1988.

### Bibliography

- Aalto, Pentti  
 1971 *Oriental Studies in Finland 1828–1918*, Helsinki (The History of Learning and Science in Finland 1828–1918, 10 b).  
 1981 “Central Asiatic Epigraphic and Manuscript Material in Finland”, *Journal Asiatique* 269, pp. 3–10.
- Canevascini, Giotto (ed.)  
 1993 *The Khotanese Saṅghāṭasūtra, A Critical Edition*, Wiesbaden (Beiträge zur Iranistik, 14).
- Donner, Kai  
 1934 *Fältmarskalken, friherre Mannerheim*, Helsingfors.
- Halén, Harry  
 1978 *Handbook of Oriental Collections in Finland*, London–Malmö (Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series, 31).  
 1999 “Baron Mannerheim’s hunt for ancient Central Asian manuscripts”, *C. G. Mannerheim in Central Asia 1906–1908*, ed. P. Varjola, Helsinki (The Museum of Cultures, exhibition catalogue), pp. 47–52.  
 1999 a “C. G. Mannerheims brev till senator Otto Donner från Kina 1907–1908”, *C. G. Mannerheim in Central Asia 1906–1908*, ed. P. Varjola, Helsinki (The Museum of Cultures, exhibition catalogue), pp. 53–61.
- de Jong, Jan Willem  
 1977 “Sanskrit Fragments of the Kāśyapaparivarta”, *Beiträge zur Indienforschung, Ernst Waldschmidt zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet*, Berlin (Veröffentlichungen des Museums für Indische Kunst Berlin, 4), pp. 247–255 [repr. in: J. W. de Jong, *Buddhist Studies*, ed. G. Schopen, Berkely 1979, pp. 513–521].
- Lahdentausta, Heli, Marjatta Parpola, Pilvi Vainonen, Asko Lehmuskallio  
 1999 “Mannerheim in Central Asia”, *C. G. Mannerheim in Central Asia 1906–1908*, ed. P. Varjola, Helsinki (The Museum of Cultures, exhibition catalogue), pp. 7–45.
- Mannerheim, Carl Gustaf  
 1940 *Across Asia from West to East in 1906–1908*, 2 vols., Helsinki (Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura — Société Finno-Ougrienne, Kansatieteellisiä Julkaisuja — Travaux Éthnographiques, 8) [repr. Oosterhout: Anthropological Publications, 1969].
- Ratia, Alpo  
 2000 “Mannerheim’s Central Asian Expedition of 1906–1908”, *International Dunhuang Project News* 15, pp. 1–3.
- Reuter, Julio Nathanael  
 1918 “Some Buddhist Fragments from Chinese Turkestan in Sanskrit and ‘Khotanese’”, *Aika-kauskirja* (Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne) 30:37 (Helsinki 1913–18), pp. 1–37, 9 pls. [repr. with some minor changes in: C. G. Mannerheim, *Across Asia from West to East in 1906–1908*, vol. 2, Helsinki 1940, pp. 1–35; repr. Oosterhout: Anthropological Publications, 1969].
- Sandberg, Peter (ed.)  
 1990 *C. G. Mannerheimin valokuvia aasian-matkalta 1906–1908, Photographs by C. G. Man-*

*nerheim from his Journey across Asia 1906–1908*, Keuruu (Travaux Ethnographiques de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, 13 A).

Sander, Lore

1968 *Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung*, Wiesbaden (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Suppl.-Bd. 8).

Sims-Williams, Nicholas, and Harry Halén

1980 "The Middle Iranian Fragments in Sogdian Script from the Mannerheim Collection", *Studia Orientalia* 51.13.

Toda, Hirofumi

1984 "A Classification of the Nepalese Manuscripts of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra [(1)]", *Tokushima Daigaku Kyōyōbu kiyō* ("Bulletin of the Faculty of Liberal Arts, The University of Tokushima") 19, pp. 211–256.

1985 "A Classification of the Nepalese Manuscripts of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra (2)", *Tokushima Daigaku Kyōyōbu kiyō* ("Bulletin of the Faculty of Liberal Arts, The University of Tokushima") 20, pp. 245–284.

1997 "A Classification of the Nepalese Manuscripts of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra (14)", *Journal of Human Sciences and Arts, Faculty of Integrated Arts and Sciences, The University of Tokushima* 4, pp. 1–46.

1998 "A Classification of the Nepalese Manuscripts of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra (15)", *Journal of Human Sciences and Arts, Faculty of Integrated Arts and Sciences, The University of Tokushima* 5, pp. 21–60.

1999 "Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra. Romanized Text", *Tokushima Daigaku Sōgōkagakubu kenkyū hōkokusho* ("Study Report, Faculty of Integrated Arts and Sciences, The University of Tokushima") VI, pp. 1–50.

Varjola, Pirjo

1999 "Marshal Mannerheim's Central Asian collection in the Museum of Cultures", *C. G. Mannerheim in Central Asia 1906–1908*, ed. P. Varjola, Helsinki (The Museum of Cultures, exhibition catalogue), pp. 63–76.

Facsimiles are not included in this PDF Version.

**Random Remarks  
on and around the Mannerheim Fragment  
of the *Saddharmapundarikasūtra***

**Akira YUYAMA**

These are intended to be random notes in appraisal of Dr. Klaus Wille's enlightening article printed before this: "The Sanskrit *Saddharmapundarikasūtra* fragment in the Mannerheim collection (Helsinki)". I am also much indebted to him for his readiness to read my remarks. He has given me learned suggestions and corrections useful for my further revisional work. Needless to say, I am alone responsible for any heresies of opinion and errors of facts to be found in my paper.

Whilst studying in Leiden for two years in 1963-1965, my interest in collecting the then hitherto-known Indic manuscripts of the Lotus Sutra grew up even more than before. I wanted to make good use of my stay in Europe before my departure for Canberra in June 1965. I was able to see a number of manuscripts kept in England and France and consequently obtained the microfilms of those manuscripts. The films were deposited for the use of my compatriot scholars.

Needless to say, I was eager to see the fragment brought back from Central Asia by the Finnish national hero, Field Marshal (the then Colonel) Baron Carl Gustaf Emil von Mannerheim (4.VI.1867-17.I.1951). In search of the so-called Mannerheim fragment of the *Saddharmapundarikasūtra* referred to in Julio Natanel Reuter's article.<sup>1</sup> I wrote to the Finno-Ugrian Society to ask about it in my letter dated 5 April 1965.

---

<sup>1</sup> J. N. Reuter, "Some Buddhist Fragments from Chinese Turkestan in Sanskrit and 'Khotanese'", *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, XXX: 37 (1913-18), p. 7. = C. G. Mannerheim, *Across Asia from West to Asia in 1906-1908* (= *Kansatieteellisiä julkaisuja : Travaux Éthnographiques*, VIII) (Helsingfors: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura / Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne, 1940) [Reprinted by Anthropological Publications, in Oosterhout N.B., The Netherlands, 1969], Volume II, 'Reuter's Article' [= Fifth Article], p. 7. — cf. A. Yuyama, *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscript Collections. A Bibliographical Guide for the Use of Students in Buddhist Philology* (= *Bibliographia Indica et Buddhica*, Pamphlet No. 2) (Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies Library, 1992), p. 25.

On 19 April, in quick reply to my query, I received a kind letter from Professor Pennti Aalto in his capacity as Secretary to the Finno-Ugrian Society. He informed me that Mannerheim's other notes and materials were in the possession of the Society but he could not locate the fragment in question in its Archives. According to him, the Mannerheim fragments were preserved among the papers of the then President of the Society, Professor Otto Donner, and that they were then at the Finnish State Archives. Professor Aalto added that he would try to look for them. To my sorrow, no information about the fragment has since then come to my notice.

On arrival in Canberra I felt rather uneasy at having to work with limited library facilities. Thereafter I realized the necessity of having good bibliographical information in order to pursue serious philological work.<sup>2</sup> Being in the Southern Hemisphere, I also felt it important to look into the background history of Indian and Buddhist researches and to learn of the activities outside of the Continent. I began thus to devote much time and energy towards this goal.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, this kind of work had led me to believe that the prime necessity is to have systematic and critical surveys of a specific topic or literature.<sup>4</sup>

With regard to the Mannerheim fragment, neither photographic reproduction nor information of its whereabouts was available. Under such circumstances I had to bring out a bibliography in order to facilitate the philological study of the Lotus Sutra with the maximum information then

---

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. A. Yuyama, "A Bibliography of the *Mahāvastu-Avadāna*", *Indo-Iranian Journal*, XI, 1 (The Hague-Paris 1968), p. 11-23: - - , *Indic Manuscripts and Chinese Blockprints (Non-Chinese Texts) of the Oriental Collection of the Australian National University Library, Canberra* (= *Centre of Oriental Studies Occasional Paper Series*, VI) (Canberra 1967), viii, 124 p.

<sup>3</sup> In the first instance I decided to make a fully annotated Japanese translation of J. W. de Jong, "Sanskrit Studies in The Netherlands", *Indian Studies Abroad*, edited by the Indian Council for Cultural Relations, New Delhi (Bombay, etc.: Asia Publishing House, 1964), p. 60-64:- J. W. ドウ・ヨング著:オランダのインド學佛教學, 印度學佛教學研究, XIV, 1 (195), p. 382(73)-359(96).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. A. Yuyama, "The Need for Systematic Bibliographies in Buddhist Sanskrit Philology", *Journal of the Institute of Chinese Studies of the Chinese University of Hong Kong*, V, 2 (Hong Kong 1972), p. 339-346 (summary in Chinese on p. 346). — also A. Yuyama, "A Report on a Göttingen Project: A Systematic Survey of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature", *Buddhist Research Information*, No. 10 (Stony Brook: The Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions, October 1983), p. 7-13. This is a report delivered on request at the VIII Congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies held at the University of Oxford on 17 August 1982.

available to me.<sup>5</sup>

This worry never went out of my mind. Towards the end of August 1992 I did not want to miss an opportunity to visit Helsinki in search of the very fragment on my way to Fagernes in Norway to participate in the Sixth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies. My cherished dream to see it was not realized! However, I am now shocked to learn that its whereabouts were known at the time of my visit to the Helsinki University Library. It has been kept there since 1971 as a deposit of the Finno-Ugrian Society. At the same time, I regret very much that the information given explicitly by Harry Halén in his meticulous work had simply escaped my attention.<sup>6</sup> I must add here, however, that I learned a great deal of interesting information on the Tibetan materials like *Mdo-man* kept therein.

To my great regret, I have not yet seen an exhibition catalogue under the editorship of Pirjo Varjola, which seems to offer a number of important facts in this connection.<sup>7</sup> It was therefore an extremely pleasant surprise to see Dr. Klaus Wille of Göttingen publishing the present enlightening article under review here. I am much indebted to him for various important facts about Mannerheim's travels and the fragment in question.

On this occasion I must regrettably acknowledge that some geographers were rather uninterested in written documents. Most of the important materials were acquired just by accident.

A famed American geographer-explorer at Yale, Ellsworth Huntington (16.IX.1876-17.X.1947), obtained a small but extremely interesting fragment at Khādalik only by chance. I was much thrilled to find that the so-

---

<sup>5</sup> On the Mannerheim fragment see e.g. A. Yuyama, *A Bibliography of the Sanskrit Texts of the Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra* (= *Oriental Monograph Series*, V) (Canberra: Centre of Oriental Studies at the Australian National University in association with A.N.U. Press, 1970), p. 29. — I have also treated Buddhist Sanskrit literature found in Central Asia in my paper: “中央アジアの梵語仏典”, 東洋学術研究, XXIII, 1 (Tokyo 1984), p. 78 (cum n. 73 on p. 91a).

<sup>6</sup> Harry Halén, *Handbook of Oriental Collections in Finland. Manuscripts, xylographs, inscriptions, and Russian minority literature* (= *Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series*, XXXI) (London-Malmö: Curzon Press Ltd., 1978), p. 71: No. 213. — cf. Yuyama, *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscript Collections* (1992), p. 2.

<sup>7</sup> C. G. Mannerheim in Central Asia 1906-1908, edited by P. Varjola (= *Exhibition Catalogue of the Museum of Culture*) (Helsinki 1999).

called "Huntington Fragment F" was nothing but a torn portion of the same folio kept then in the British Museum (now British Library).<sup>8</sup>

A German geographer-explorer Emil Trinkler (19.V.1896-19.IV.1931) brought back nine folios of the Lotus Sutra, which were missing from the so-called Kashgar Manuscript from Khotan kept in the Petrovsky Collection in Saint-Petersburg.<sup>9</sup>

Another example is the universally known Stockholm-born Sven Hedin (19.II.1865-26.XI.1952), who brought back an enormous amount of invaluable Tibetan documents to his hometown. It is a great pity, however, that the acquisition records of some important materials are very little known. They are all indispensable texts for Buddhist philology.<sup>10</sup>

In his diary on 4 December 1906 at Yotkan in the vicinity of Khotan, however, Mannerheim writes about his purchase of materials. Incidentally, the village named Yotkan should be on Map I among the folded maps. But I am unable to spot it there.

---

<sup>8</sup> For further details see my "Introductory Remarks" in Akira YUYAMA and Hirofumi TODA, *The Huntington Fragment F of the Saddharmapundarikasūtra* (= *Studia Philologica Buddhica, Occasional Paper Series*, II) (Tokyo: The Reiyukai Library, 1977), p. 1-4, 2 pl.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Heinz Bechert, *Über die „Marburger Fragmente“ des Saddharmapundarika (Mit einem Beitrag von Jonchay Rinpoche). Ernst Waldschmidt zum 75. Geburtstag am 15.7.1972* (= *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, I. Philol.-hist. Klasse, Jahrgang 1972, Nr. 1) (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 81 p., incl. 4 plates on p. 67f. (= Honda-Deguchi Nos. 24, 27, 37 and 38); see the reviews esp. by Jacques May, *IIJ*, XVII, 2-4 (1975), p. 270-273 and Ronald E. Emmerick, *OLZ*, LXXIII, 4 (1978), Sp. 390-392; — cf. also Yuyama, *SP-Bibl.*, p. 29f.

Unfortunately, I have long failed to consult Gerd Gropp, *Archäologische Funde aus Khotan, Chinesische Ostturkestan: Die Trinkler-Sammlung im Übersee-Museum, Bremen* (= *Monographien der Witttheit zu Bremen*, XI) (Bremen: Frisrich Röver, 1974), 409 p.: — cf. *Bibliography of Asian Studies*, 1975 (Ann Arbor 1978), No. 00841 (p. 32b-33a).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. e.g. Nils Simonsson, *Indo-tibetische Studien. Die Methoden der tibetischen Übersetzer, untersucht im Hinblick auf die Bedeutung ihrer Übersetzungen für die Sanskritphilologie*, I (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri AB, 1957), 291 p., 2-page plates (between p. 16-17). — on this enlightening work see the reviews among others: C. Régamey, *Kratylos*, III (1958), p. 146-150, J. W. de Jong, *IIJ*, III, 3 (1959), p. 216-219, G. Uray, *AOH*, VIII (1959), p. 327-332.

Cf. also Helmut Eimer, "Tibetica Stockholmiensia (I-VII)", *ZAS*, VI (1972), p. 603-681 (incl. 1 colour pl. on p. 607), VII (1973), p. 301-352, VIII (1974), p. 179-240, IX (1975), p. 37-86, X (1976), p. 625-674, XI (1977), p. 507-554, XII (1978), 317-358. — This meticulous work has been privately reprinted in one volume with a subtitle: *Handliste der tibetischen Texte der Sven-Hedin-Stiftung und des Ethnographischen Museums zu Stockholm*.

“... Any discoveries of value had, no doubt, already been secured by the well-known archaeologist Dr Stein, who had visited this locality a couple months before us. It was only after they had foisted all kinds of rubbish on me, which I brought for want of anything better, that objects in a better state of preservation were produced. I secured the best ones as I was preparing to mount my horse and leave the village. This resulted in my buying practically all that could be had. With the help of Badruddin Khan, the former Indian aksakal of Khotan, to whom Mr Macartney had kindly given me a letter, the prices were beaten down considerably.”<sup>11</sup>

It is said that Carl Gustaf Mannerheim wrote his diary originally in Swedish and that its English version is not always accurate (cf. Wille, *op.cit.*, n. 3).<sup>12</sup> Unfortunately, I have not been able to see the original Swedish version. Mannerheim's book of his travels across Asia on horseback, with its clear black-and-white photographs, is of immense interest. A Danish translation from the Swedish with a foreword by Sven Hedin, dated 20 May 1940 in Stockholm, followed by a message to the readers by G. Mannerheim (signed in February 1940), appeared in Copenhagen in 1941.<sup>13</sup> In this book the diary covering the period from 29 November to 11 December 1906 at Khotan and its surroundings occupies pages 74-88. A nice photograph of Badruddin Khān with his relative (child) is to be found on p. 79. I have not seen the German version.

The Dutch version of Mannerheim's travels through Asia on horseback translated from the Finnish seems to be an abridged edition with some different photos in a different order. His expeditions to Asia must have occupied an important part in his career.<sup>14</sup>

In fact, in his memoirs Mannerheim devotes a lengthy section to the period between 1906 and 1908. Some different photographs of importance were

---

<sup>11</sup> See Mannerheim, *Across Asia*, I, p. 89.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology* (= *ABIA*): Volume XV for the Years 1940-1947 (Leyden: Kern Institute / Printed in Leyden by E. J. Brill Ltd., 1950), No. 2259 (p. 184); — cf. *ABIA*, XVI for 1948-1953 (1958), No. 3759 (p. 317b-318a).

<sup>13</sup> C. G. Mannerheim, *Fra Samarkand til Peking paa Hesteryg*. Oversat fra Svensk efter “Resa genom Asien” af Jesper Ewald og Peter de Hemmer Gudme (København: Gyldendalske Boghandel – Nordisk Forlag, 1941), XII, 628 p. (including numerous photos and plans), 1 frontisp. (a portrait), 1 folded map.: — Sven Hedin, “Fortale”, p. V-IX; G. Mannerheim, “Til Læseren”, p. XI-XII.

<sup>14</sup> C. G. Mannerheim, *Rit door Azië* (Geautoriseerde Nederlandsche Bewerking van A. Meijer-Forsberg en D. Hans) (With a preface by D. Hans written in January 1943 in The Hague) [Oorspronkelijke titel: *Ratsain balki Aasian*] (Amsterdam: A. J. G. Strengtholt, n.d.).



published in this book written in Swedish.<sup>15</sup>

Incidentally, during his account of his stay in the village Yotkan Mannerheim mentions the Japanese at the end of his diary on 4 December 1906. No personal name is given there:<sup>16</sup>

“... The Japanese, who had been here a couple of years ago, and other travellers had bought up many these interesting documents and year by year it is becoming more and more difficult to find anything of value. ...”

Those Japanese may well be the second Otani expedition, which was conducted in 1908-1909. In fact, the young Zuichō TACHIBANA (橘瑞超: 7.I.1890-4.XI.1968) and his elder partner Eizaburō NOMURA (野村榮三郎) were around this area. However, both of them left Kashgar on 20 August for Kashmir across the arakhorum via Maral Bāši and Yarkand. They arrived in Srinagar on 11 November 1908. From India Tachibana went to London, where he met Mark Aurel Stein (Budapest 26.XI.1862-Kabul 26.X.1943) after his return from the second expedition (1906-1908). He visited Stockholm to meet Sven Hedin on his return from the third expedition (1905-1908). To my regret, however, I have found no record of Mannerheim's meeting with the Japanese party. At least, they might have not met each other in Central Asia.<sup>17</sup>

Incidentally, on his return from his expeditions Mannerheim wrote a detailed ethnological report with many illustrations on plates.<sup>18</sup> It is interesting to note that he collected a number of Yöğür words (*ibid.*, p. 59-70), to

<sup>15</sup> G. Mannerheim, *Minnen*, Del I: 1882-1930 (Helsingfors: Holger Schildts Förlag, 1951), p. 45-128 (incl. figures and 1 map of his routes covering two facing p. 89f.): “1906-1908: Ritten genom Asien”. — Incidentally, Volume II for 1931-1946 appeared in 1952 with “Personregister” on p. 449-459.

<sup>16</sup> See Mannerheim, *Across Asia*, I, p. 89; its Danish version, p. 78. Incidentally, in its Dutch version no description of the Japanese is to be found.

<sup>17</sup> In this connection I owe much to Nobuo YAMADA, who has left brief but very comprehensive comments for the reprint edition of the records of the Otani Expeditions in two large volumes: 大谷家蔵版・復刻 新西域記 (東京・井草出版, 1984), 別冊: 山田信夫, “解題”, p. 1-28. This article is supplemented by a detailed bibliography of the Otani Expeditions by Akio KATAYAMA: 片山章雄, “大谷探検隊中央アジア関係文献目録”, *ibid.*, p. 29-41 (mostly the works in Japanese). Incidentally, this reprint edition has been largely reduced in size (A4) of the first edition published almost in the present A3 format under the editorship of Yoshitarō UEHARA: 上原芳太郎編・新西域記 (東京・有光社, 1939).

<sup>18</sup> C. G. E. Mannerheim, “A Visit to the Sarö and Shera Yöğurs”, *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, XXVII (Helsinki 1911), p. 1-72 (incl. 33 photos), V tables (incl. 36 ill.).

which a famed Finnish Altaist Gustav John Ramstedt (22.X.1873-25.XI.1950) supplied the Mongolian equivalents (cf. *ibid.*, p. 3). We cannot overlook the importance of the contributions to the Japanese language by the latter.<sup>19</sup>

It may be added here that Dr. Klaus Wille has given a thorough description of the acquisition and find-spots of such materials in connection with the manuscript from Khādālik. He vividly describes the role played Badruddīn Khān of Khotan with extensive bibliographical information.<sup>20</sup>

★

Wille's skillfulness in reading the fragment is to be much admired, as he himself does Reuter's. As a matter of fact, Reuter's description of this same fragment is brief but indeed necessary and sufficient. In his introductory remarks he says:

“... It is an unfortunate circumstance that the locality where these MANNERHEIM fragments, as I propose to call them, were found or claimed by purchase cannot be determined. ...” (Reuter, *op.cit.*, p. 3).

After his physical explanation of the folio Reuter writes as follows:

“Fragment 5 (not figured).

“This is a fragment from the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, printed text p. 40<sup>16</sup> to 41<sup>14</sup>, beginning thus: dikṣv ... de[śayiṣyanti] ... The reading of the fragment, as far as it is possible to decipher it, appears to differ but slightly from the edition. In the fragment lokadhātu is fem.; for Śāriputra the fragment has Śāradvatīputra, for nānādhātvo : anekadhātvo; saddharmaḥ is written sadharmaḥ; in the phrase sattvānāṃ dharmāṃ deśitavantaḥ the fragment leaves out dharmāṃ.”(*ibid.*, p. 7).

Despite his painstaking research work on the Mannerheim fragments Reuter's name does not seem to appear in the writings of Mannerheim. The name Dr. G. J. Ramstedt, Professor of Altaic Languages at the Alexander

<sup>19</sup> Cf. e.g. *Aufsätze und Vorträge von G. J. Ramstedt*, bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Pentti Aalto (Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura / Société Finno-Ougrienne, 1951), p. 112 – see esp. “Vorwort des Herausgebers”, p. 3-6. One may also refer to a detailed list of his work published on the occasion of his 125<sup>th</sup> birthday: *Gustav John Ramstedt, Philologe - Ausgewählte Literaturnachweise aus dem Bestand der Akademiebibliothek, 1888/89* (Berlin: Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften / Akademiebibliothek, 1998), 6 p.

<sup>20</sup> *Fragments of a Manuscript of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra from Khādālik*, edited by Klaus Wille (= *Lotus Sutra Manuscript Series*, III) (Published by the Soka Gakkai in cooperation with the Institute of Oriental Philosophy, Tokyo, and the Seminar für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde of the University of Göttingen, 2000), esp. p. 1-5.

University of Helsinki, has been cited here and there.<sup>21</sup> Nor does he seem to make any reference to the Otani expeditions, either by personal or organizational name.

★

Now, I am much pleased to see that Dr. Klaus Wille has added more to his elaborate paper. The reader will no doubt learn a lot from his writing. After a glance at the contents I herewith wish to make a few random notes.

**Recto 1 and Verso 3:** Reuter has taken *lokadhātu-* here as feminine. Wille may have preferred *aprameyāsv asaṃkhyeyāsu* with *lokadhātuṣu*, loc.pl., as he reads: (recto, line 1) ..(m)[eyā].. .. [yāsu lok](a)dhā.., and (verso, l. 3) *aprame[yāsv a].. .. [y]ā[su l]oka(dh)[āt](u)[śu tath]āgatā+ .* Indeed, *ā* of *..[y]ā[su]* supports the feminine ending in *-āsu*. He then carefully cites variant readings from Nepalese, Gilgit and Central Asian manuscripts (n. 27 & 41; cf. also Toda, *Saddhp(C)*, p. 24). The fragment may have preferred the feminine locative ending in *-āsu* to masculine *-eṣu*. However, there is no evidence that the ending *-āsu* must be the expected reading in all these cases.

In fact, *°-dhātu-* is often used both in feminine and masculine forms: cf. Edgerton, *BHSD*, p. 464a, *q.v.*<sup>22</sup> One can easily dig out these occurrences by consulting the indices published to date.<sup>23</sup> Let us now hope to see a grammatical index based upon mathematical statistics, as demonstrated by the word index compiled by Zuiei ITOH and his group!

In this connection we eagerly await the other folios of the same manuscript, so we can examine this question more precisely. In the meantime it may not

<sup>21</sup> See e.g. Mannerheim, *Minnen*, I (1951), p. 82 and 126.

<sup>22</sup> Reference may also be made to A. Yuyama, *A Grammar of the Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā (Sanskrit Recension A)* (= *Faculty of Asian Studies: Oriental Monograph Series*, XIV) (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1973), p. §6.26 (p. 53). — abbrev. *RgsGr* hereinafter.

<sup>23</sup> *Index to the Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra — Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese* —, edited by Yasunori EJIMA of The Society for Studies of the Lotus Sutra, Fascicle IX (Tokyo: The Reiyukai, 1991), p. 886f., *loka-dhātu*, s.v. — This index is based on the edition Kern-Nanjio. The following one is based on the edition Wogihara-Tsuchida. It is remarkably characterized as a word-index edited on the basis of mathematical statistics: 伊藤瑞叡・村上征勝・塚本貫康・五十嵐信彦(編): 梵文法華經荻原・土田本總索引 / *Comprehensive Index to Wogihara and Tsuchida's Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtram*, by Zueiei ITOH, Masakatsu MURAKAMI, Kankō TSUKADA (and) Nobuhiko IAGARASI (Tokyo: Benseisya, 1993), p. 308a-b, *loka-dhātu*, s.v.

be useless to refer to the examples found in the Turfan texts. With regard to these references we are much indebted again to Wille's untiring efforts, following those of his predecessors like Frau Dr. Lore Sander:<sup>24</sup>

... ga[nṅā-na]d[i]-vālukā-sa[m]e[s]u loka-[dhātu]ṣv ... (masc.),<sup>25</sup> ... <buddha-kṣetra-pramā>nu-rajaḥ samām loka-dhātavām ... (fem.sg./masc.pl.?),<sup>26</sup> ... [l]oka-dhātum paripūrṇam ... (masc.),<sup>27</sup> ... loka-dhā[t]au ... (masc.?).<sup>28</sup>

**Verso 6:** The repetition of the perfect active participle *-ta-vat-*, closing the paragraph in the simple future form has a fresh and lively ring: *dharmam deśitavantah/ °vanto* (= KN 41.3-4, 4-5, 7) and *dharmam deśayiṣyanti* (= KN 41.14, 15, 18), etc. Thanks to the painstaking endeavours of Professor Chiang Chung-hsin of Peking, an extremely tiny torn fragment has been made available from the Otani-Lüshun manuscript: */// (dha) rmaṃ deśa(y) [i] ///*<sup>29</sup> The photograph on page 46 makes me somewhat suspicious that the "i" on top of the *akṣara* "śa" were just worm-eaten, damaged or worn out. This may be a mere guess of mine! One may perhaps read the supposed "i" on top of the damaged *akṣara* as "ya"! Then, the reading *deśayiṣyanti* may doubtlessly be expected.

**Verso 2:** On this line are found two *avagraha* signs, which are not written in the manuscript as noted by Wille himself: ... *te 'pi ... lābhino 'bbūvan* ...

The corresponding portion, in the so-called Kashgar Manuscript from Khotan reads: (folio 48b1) ... *te pi sarve nutta(.2)rāyām ... lābhino babbūvu ye pi* ... ; but Toda, *Saddhp*(C), p. 24: ... *te 'pi sarve 'nuttarāyām ... lābhino babbūvu(h)*

<sup>24</sup> Reference is made to *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden* (= SHT), begonnen von Ernst Waldschmidt (= *Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland*, X).

<sup>25</sup> SHT, Teil 3, unter Mitarbeit von Walter Clawiter und Lore Sander-Holzmann, herausgegeben von E. Waldschmidt (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1971), Kat.-Nr. 933-934, b R17 (p. 198).

<sup>26</sup> Cf. SHT, Teil 3, Kat.-Nr. 976, R6 (p. 238, cum n. 22; auch Tafel 91)!

<sup>27</sup> SHT, Teil 7, herausgegeben von Heinz Bechert, beschrieben von Klaus Wille (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1995), Kat.-Nr. 1643+1652, b A1 (p. 56).

<sup>28</sup> Cf. SHT, Teil 8 (2000), Kat.-Nr. 1967 (p. 137).

<sup>29</sup> 蒋忠新編·旅順博物館藏梵文法華經殘片·影印版羅馬字版/Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Fragments from the Lüshun Museum Collection: Facsimile Edition and Romanized Text, edited by Jiang Zhongxin/旅順博物館所藏梵文法華經斷簡·写真版及びローマ字版(Lüshun Museum – Soka Gakkai 1997), p. 46-47: A-1 (Recto), line 3. — cf. Yuyama, *SP-Bibl.*, p. 30-32.

ye 'pi ...! In this manuscript is found no *avagraha* either.<sup>30</sup> But the expected *avagrabas* are always shown by Toda, *Saddhp(C)* as well.<sup>31</sup>

Incidentally, it is an important fact that this manuscript was actually copied in Khotan.<sup>32</sup> Toda has corrected folio numbers and given a table of correspondence to edition Kern-Nanjio. This facilitates our study a great deal.<sup>33</sup>

Scribes often try to keep the hiatus by reading *a-* in a number of cases when they think it absolutely necessary to make the meaning clear. It is therefore hoped that, when an author claims to offer a faithfully transliterated text, every door must be left open for further critical editorial work. A symbol like an apostrophe is frequently misleading, if not mistaken. Particularly when the *avagraha* denotes a negative sense, utmost care must be taken. Needless to say, this may add an idea opposite to the original intention.<sup>34</sup>

In the case of *bbūvan* (for *abbūvan*, 3 pl.aor.), though this is less probable, it could be an augmentless preterite form. A possibility of *babbūvu*, 3 pl.perf., not *babbūvuh* as is expected by Toda, *Saddhp(C)*, p. 24,<sup>35</sup> may not be excluded (cf. Edgerton, *BHSGr.* §33.2). But a very strange form of *\*babbūvan*, 3 pl.perf.,

<sup>30</sup> *Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka-Sūtra. Kashgar Manuscript*, edited by Lokesh Chandra, with a foreword by Heinz Bechert (= *Śāta-Piṭaka Series*, CCXXXIX) (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1976; reprinted with a preface of Lokesh Chandra by The Reiyukai, Tokyo, 1978), p. 48.

<sup>31</sup> On the orthography of the Kashgar Ms see Toda, *Saddhp(C)*, p. xiii (under §2).

<sup>32</sup> See a stimulating article by Ronald E. Emmerick, "Some Khotanese Donors", *Mémorial Jean de Menasce*, édité par Ph. Gignoux et A. Tafazzoli (= *Fondation culturelle iranienne*, CLXXXV) (Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste, 1974), p. 383-388, and Plates XIX-XXI.

<sup>33</sup> Hirofumi TODA, *Notes on the Kashgar Manuscript of the Saddharmapuṇḍarikāsūtra* (= *Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica: Series Minor*, II) (Tokyo: The Reiyukai Library, 1977), ii, 39 p.

<sup>34</sup> See e.g. A. Yuyama, "The Tathāgata Prabhūtaratna in the Stūpa", *Amalā Vijñā: Aspects of Buddhist Studies — Professor P. V. Bapat Felicitation Volume*, edited by N. H. Samtani (Associate Editor: H. S. Prasad) (= *Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica*, LXIII) (Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications — A Division of Indian Book Centre, 1989), p. 181-186.

<sup>35</sup> Toda has examined a number of peculiarities in the Kashgar Ms in comparison with the so-called Kawaguchi Ms kept in the Toyo Bunko (cf. Yuyama, *SP-Bibl.*, p. 14). In the case of perfect forms he naturally reads *babbūvu(r)* by sandhi: cf. Kawaguchi Ms., folio 16b3: 'bbūvan, as in Kern-Nanjio 41.9 prose: 戸田宏文, "西域出土梵文法華經研究覚書(四)", 徳島大学教養部紀要 (人文・社会科学), VIII (1973), p. 85. — Incidentally, Kawaguchi Ms, one of the oldest manuscripts from Nepal, is dated Tuesday, 12 October 1070 by Claus Vogel, "The Dated Nepalese Manuscripts of the Saddharmapuṇḍarikāsūtra", *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philol.-hist. Klasse*, Jahrgang 1974, p. 201.

may appear in other parts of the manuscript! It is a pity that the previous \**abhūvan* (= ed. KN 40.16) or the like is illegible (probably missing) in our Mannerheim fragment. One must be open to every possibility!

In the case of *pi* (for *api*) the possibility of Middle Indicisms must not be simply ruled out before the final decision is made in editorial work. Otherwise, this kind of “faithful” transliteration is already a half-finished critical edition. It is not always easy to decide which reading is absolutely right. In the Lotus Sūtra itself hundreds of examples of *api* (*pi*) are reported in the indexes.<sup>36</sup> Two examples of *apī*, m.c., are reported by Ito and others in their index: ed. Wogihara-Tsuchida p. 250.15 (XIII verse 58d) and 316.9 (XVIII vs. 68a), where Kern-Nanjio (293.6 & 373.3) read *api*, unmetr.! Cf. Kern-Nanjio p. 373 n. 2: v.l. *apī*!

Specialists will naturally be interested to see the corresponding readings in the Gilgit manuscripts. As a matter of fact, they offer interesting readings. Group A as classified by Shōkō WATANABE reads: folio 134b8 *ekām pi gāthām śṛṇuyāna* ... (ed. Watanabe II, p. 144), and Group B folio 97b2 *ekām pi gāthām pi śṛṇuitva* ... (ed. Watanabe II, p. 274).<sup>37</sup>

It is worthwhile to consult the corresponding portions in the so-called Kashgar Manuscript in such a case: in the former verse it offers a different reading, i.e. around folio 281a3 (cf. Toda, *Saddhp(C)*, p. 143). In the latter case it reads: *ekāpi gāthā śṛṇuyāna-m-eva* ... (folio 359a7), cf. Toda's emendation to *ekā(m) pi gāthā(m)* ... (Toda, *Saddhp(C)*, p. 177). The former case is the same in the Farhād-Bēg fragment: folio 25b (Honda-Deguchi, p. 37: Photo No. 106, line 5; cf. Toda, *Saddhp(C)*, p. 246).<sup>38</sup> The latter is not extant either in the F xii.7 or in the Khādalik fragments.

In connection with the Khādalik manuscript we are much indebted to the astounding efforts of Dr. Klaus Wille as quoted above. Fragment No. 66

<sup>36</sup> Cf. *Index to the Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra*, ed. Ejima, Fasc. I (Tokyo 1985), p. 69-71; also *Index to the edition Wogihara-Tsuchida*, ed. Ito et al. (Tokyo 1993), p. 23c-24c. The former index to the edition Kern-Nanjio offers their equivalents in Tibetan and Chinese.

<sup>37</sup> *Saddharmapuṇḍarika Manuscripts Found in Gilgit*, edited by Shoko Watanabe. Part I: Photographic Reproduction. Part II: Romanized Text (Tokyo: The Reiyukai, 1972-1975).

<sup>38</sup> See Yuyama, *SP-Bibl.*, p. 22f. and 47, and Honda-Deguchi, p. XI and 97 for the so-called Farhād-Bēg fragments kept in the former India Office Library under the classification number F xii.7 (= KN 247.6-317.2).

corresponding to Kern-Nanjio 293.6 is regrettably a torn folio and thus offers no aid.<sup>39</sup>

Herewith I must frankly confess how difficult it was for me to determine if *pi* after *-e/-o* must be read *'pi* or just *pi* as it is read in the manuscript, when I was editing the Recension A of the *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā* (abbrev. *Rgs* hereinafter).<sup>40</sup> As the title itself explicitly says, it is composed entirely in verse. From it I have thus collected every phenomenon of non-Sanskritic phonology and morphology (Yuyama, *RgsGr*: cf. n. 22 above). It was done so exactly because of my wish to make such analyses on each text after the model of Franklin Edgerton's monumental work.<sup>41</sup>

In order to satisfy the metre any form of *api* is to be found, i.e. either *api*, *apī*, *āpi*, *pi* (including *'pi* after *-e/-o*), or even *pī*! It becomes endless, if semantic, syntactical or stylistic analyses are to be discussed in addition! Let me quote all these occurrences in the *Rgs* here:

*api*: I.9a, 12b, 20a, II 9b, 10d, IV 2b, 3c, 5d (*sā api*), 6c (*viśeṣatāpi*), 7d (*apīha*), V 1a, 2a (*nāpi*), 9d (*kalāpi*), VI 1b, 9b, VIII 4b, XI 3a (*kāṅkṣāpi*; cf. B *kāṅkṣā ca*), 3c (*nāpi*), 7a (*cāpi*), XII 6d (*-saṃjñā api*), XIV 6a (*cāpi*), 9b (*cāpi*), 10b (*cāpi*), XV 3a, XVI 4b (*-śatāpi*), XVIII 1a (*rūpa api*), 5c (*cāpi*), 8a (*cāpi*), XIX 4b (*cāpi*), XX 8b (*cāpi*), 15cd = 16cd (*cāpi ... api*), 17c (*cāpi*), 18c (*cāpi*), 19d (*athavāpi*), 22a, 24c (*nāpi*), XXI 8a (*athavāpy a-*), XXIII 1d (*-gaṇān api*), XXV 1b (*nāpi*), 3d (*akuśalaṃ api*, metr.), 6a (*cāpi*), 6c (*cāpi*), XXVII 6b (*nāpi*), XXVIII 3c (*cāpi*), XXIX 1c (*api kbo puna ...*), 10a (*kiṃ cāpi rūpaṃ api*), 12b (*cāpy atihatāpy atha*, cf. Tib. ... *-'am ... -kyan-run*), XXXI 5c (*bhavate api*!), 7d, XXXII 5b-d (*api ... , api ... , tatha ...*); — cf. XXXI 5c *bhavate api*!

*āpi* in *yady āpi*: X 6c/d (*yady āpi ... , tatha pī ...* (cf. Tib. *kyan*!; also *pī* below), XVI 5a (*yady āpi ...*; Tib. *yan*, Chin. 雖; Taisho VIII 680b24 難!). — This may have escaped Edgerton's attention (cf. Yuyama, *RgsGr* §3.6; Edgerton, *BHSGr* §3.5-11).<sup>42</sup>

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Wille, *Fragments of a Manuscript of the Saddharma-puṇḍarikāsūtra from Khādaliq* (Tokyo 2000), p. 89.

<sup>40</sup> A. Yuyama, *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā* (Sanskrit Recension A), edited with an Introduction, Bibliographical Notes and a Tibetan Version from Tunhuang (Cambridge / London-New York-Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1976), lxxii, 214 p., 1 frontisp.— abbrev. *Rgs A* hereinafter.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. esp. Yuyama, *RgsGr* §1.4; also 湯山明, “エジヤトンの仏教梵語研究の学史的考察”, 渡邊文磨博士追悼論集・原始仏教と大乘仏教, II (京都・永田文昌堂, 1993), p. 45-83; — cf. J. W. de Jong, *A Brief History of Buddhist Studies in Europe and America* (Tokyo: Kōsei Publishing Co., 1997), p. 80f. (also p. 49-56, et al.).

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Franklin Edgerton, “The *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*”, *Indo-Iranian Journal*, V, 1 (1961), p. 1-18. — This is based solely upon Edward Conze, “The Calcutta Manuscript of the *Ratnaguṇasaṃcayagāthā*”, *Indo-Iranian Journal*, IV, 1 (1960), p. 37-58.

'pi: II 12b (*nāyako 'pi*, cf. Tib. B *ston-pas-kyan-ni*; cf. Rgs B *nāyako yam*, Tib.A *ston-pa 'di-yis*, i.e. *yam* = 'yam); IV 4b (*yan-nirvṛte 'pi*); VI 2c (*ye 'pi*), 3d (*ye 'pi*), IX 2c (*no 'pi*; cf. Rgs B *nāpi*), XII 2a (*ye 'pi*), XVIII (*ete 'pi*), XX 22b (*-e 'pi*), XXII 12c (*puno 'pi* = Skt. *punar api*, unmetr.), XXIV 1a (*māro 'pi*), XXXI 2d (*-guṇe 'pi*).

*pi*: This is not always easy (cf. *pi!*). Edgerton has carefully discussed it in his *BHSGr* (§4.1ff.):

*pi* after *anusvāra* (cf. Edgerton, *BHSGr* §4.3): XXI 3b *pūrvam pi* (so also ed. Vaidya!; cf. Skt. B *pūrve pi* / 'pi, so Obermiller).

*pi* after a vowel -a (cf. Edgerton, *BHSGr* §4.11): all but one case read a negative particle *na*, and the Tibetan version is indifferent: IV 6c *na pi* (or possibly *n'api*?; cf. Tib. *med-cin*); V 2b, X 4d, XVIII 2C, XX 11d, 12d, XXVI 5d, XXVII 6c, XXVIII 4d, XXIX 1b (*na ca ... na pi ca ...*; for *na ca* see Yuyama, *RgsGr*, Appendix §6-10), and XXX 7a. — *buddha pi* XII 1c (Obermiller prints in Devanāgarī *buddhapi* = *buddh'api*?; Tib. *saṅs-rgyas-kyan*).

*pī*, m.c., for *pi*: *tatha pī* X 6d (cf. under *āpi* above; Obermiller prints in Devanāgarī *tathapī* = *tath'apī*? Vaidya *tathapī*, unmetr.!: Tib. *kyan* only).

*pi* after a vowel -ā, nom.pl.masc. (cf. also Edgerton, *BHSGr* §4.12): *buddhā pi yāvata* XXVII 1c (cf. Tib.A *saṅs-rgyas ji-sñed-kyan*, B *saṅs-rgyas ji-sñed-pa'an*); this may well be a result of a secondary sandhi, i.e. possibly *buddhāpi*; for *yāvata*, nom.pl.m., see Yuyama, *RgsGr* §22.18.

\*

In spare moments during my work on this last portion I flipped through a book which had come to my hand a few days before. It is the fruit of truly international cooperation under the able editorship of Professor Jens Braarvig.<sup>43</sup> I am indeed pleased to see it appear at such a high speed and with this quality. While riffling through it quickly, two meticulous articles instantly caught my eye,<sup>44</sup> since I was just then treating *api* as shown above and my immediate interest lies in the *Mahāvastu-Avadāna*.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>43</sup> *Buddhist Manuscripts*, Volume I, under the general editorship of Jens Braarvig (= *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection*, I) (Oslo: Hermes Publishing, 2000), xxii, 302 p., XII facsimile plates.

<sup>44</sup> Torkel Brekke, "The Camgīsūtra of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins", *ibid.*, p. 53-62, esp. p. 54f. (cum n. 9) on *pi*; and Seishi Karashima, "A fragment of the Prātimokṣa-Vibhaṅga of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins", *ibid.*, p. 233-241.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. A. Yuyama, "Mahāvastu-Avadāna — Towards a New Critical Edition —", *ARIRIAB*, II (1998/1999), p. 21-38 (in Japanese); - - , "Mahāvastu and Mahāvastu-Avadāna", *Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka: Festgabe für Adelheid Mette*, hrsg. von Christine Chojnacki, Jens-Uwe Hartmann und Volker M. Tschannerl (= *Indica et Tibetica*, XXXVII) (Swisttal-Odendorf 2000), p. 533-540.



For their grammatical analyses it may be worth looking at the *Rgs* as yet another good example, e.g. among many others: *-ehi*, instr.pl. (Brekke p. 54; cf. Yuyama, *RgsGr* §8.76-77, also 8.78) and its function as a locative-like instrumental (Karashima p. 236 n. 28; cf. Yuyama, *RgsGr* §7.26).

A new paragraph must now be made in my systematic survey of *Vinaya* literature.<sup>46</sup> Dr. Lore Sander of Berlin is to be commended for her initiative into this identification. She has drawn the attention of many serious scholars all over the world.<sup>47</sup> The Schøyen Collection indeed deserves the name of the “Dead Sea Scrolls of Buddhism”.<sup>48</sup> This amazing news reached these far-flung eastern isles through the able offices of Professor Kazunobu MATSUDA at Bukkyō University in Kyoto.<sup>49</sup>

In this connection, mention must be made also of the British Library collection of Kharoṣṭhī manuscripts from Gandhāra. Such discoveries are not just for Buddhists and Buddhologists but for the world of knowledge. It had not escaped the attention of foremost specialist like Professor Richard Salomon of Seattle.<sup>50</sup> This news was spread through the mass media. A good example is from the National Geographic Society in Washington D.C.<sup>51</sup> Richard Salomon’s comment is cited therein: “They won’t revolutionize our understanding of Buddhism, but they will clarify the origins and devel-

---

<sup>46</sup> A. Yuyama, *Vinaya-Texte* (= *Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur*. Im Auftrage der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, herausgegeben von Heinz Bechert, I) (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1979): one may place on p. 40 anew §1.65.S.1: “Vinaya-Vibhaṅga zum Bhikṣuprātimokṣa der Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins”!

<sup>47</sup> Cf. e.g. *Manuscripts from the Himalayas and the Indian Subcontinent: Catalogue 17* (London: Sam Fogg Rare Books and Manuscripts, 1996), p. 46-47; also *Buddhist Manuscripts*, I (Oslo 2000), p. xiii-xv: “General Introduction”, by Jens Braarvig.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. a kind of private circulation in limited number of Martin Schøyen, *The Schøyen Collection: Checklist of Manuscripts 1-2393*, compiled by Elizabeth Gano Sørenssen. 14<sup>th</sup> edition, 2<sup>nd</sup> revised issue (Oslo: In Principio Press, September 1997), p. 81: §5.17. “Dead Sea Scrolls of Buddhism” and Far East: MSS 2179, 2372-2386 & 2416.

<sup>49</sup> 松田和信, “アフガニスタンからノルウェーへ — 本当はなかったことになるかもしれない話 —”, 仏教大学総合研究所報, No. 13 (December 1997), p. 24-28, including 2 photos.

<sup>50</sup> Richard Salomon, “A Preliminary Survey of Some Early Buddhist Manuscripts Recently Acquired by the British Library”, *JAS*, CXVII, 2 (April-June 1997), p. 353-358.

<sup>51</sup> Boris Weintraub, “Scrolls Offer a Glimpse into Buddhism’s Past”, *National Geographic (Magazine)*, CXCI, 3 (March 1997), p. 2c (with a coloured photo of a torn birch bark fragment).

opment of traditions and texts.”

To our great pleasure, those materials are now being examined by serious scholars in related fields of study.<sup>52</sup> A group of scholars are occupied in deciphering and editing such materials. We can see the beautiful fruit of their hard labour under the leadership of Richard Salomon, who, in this book, gives a comprehensive survey of Buddhism and Buddhist literature more in detail.<sup>53</sup> The forthcoming volumes will be eagerly awaited by any scholar engaged in related fields of study.

I am very much looking forward to reading these volumes in print more thoroughly. I am personally interested primarily in the philological side of these materials. At the same time, my interest has always lain in the sphere of development of Buddhism — say, how far to the west Buddhism had spread or propagated in Central Asia. So far important archaeological excavations together with the unearthed written documentation have offered information on this topic.<sup>54</sup>

The contributions begun by the Soviet Union cannot be neglected. Philologists learn a great deal from archaeologists in this regard.<sup>55</sup> Epigraphical works often offer important information.<sup>56</sup> The Soviet-Russian schol-

<sup>52</sup> See e.g. Graham Shaw, “Buddhism Unrolled?”, *The Oriental and India Office Collections Newsletter*, LIII-LIV (London 1997), p. 2-5, including ills.

<sup>53</sup> Richard Salomon with contributions by Raymond Allchin and Mark Barnard, *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls from Gandhāra. The British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments*. With a Foreword by His Holiness the Dalai Lama (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1999), xx p. (incl. 4 pl.-col. ills.), 273 p., 34 ills., 59 figs., 3 maps.

<sup>54</sup> With regard to Buddhist literature from Central Asia I wish herewith to cite a comprehensive work: Lore Sander, “Buddhist Literature in Central Asia”, *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, IV, 1 (Colombo 1979), p. 52b-75b; 井ノ口泰淳, “シルクロード出土の仏典”, シルクロードと仏教文化 (東京・東洋哲学研究所, 1979), p. 181-218 [first published in the *Tōyō Gakujutsu Kenkyū* / 東洋学術研究, XVII, 6 (Nov. 1978) and XVIII, 1 (Jan. 1979)].

<sup>55</sup> Among others see e.g. Grégoire Frumkin, *Archaeology in Soviet Central Asia* (Leiden-Köln: E. J. Brill, 1970), XVIII, 217 p., LXVII plates, 39 figs., 19 maps.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. e.g. V. V. Vertogradova, *Indijskaja epigrafika uz Kara-Tepe v Starom Termeze. Problemy dešifrovki i interpretacii* (Rossijskaja Akademija Nauk: Institut Vostokovedenija) (Moskva: Izdatel'skaja Firma “Vostočnaja Literatura” RAN, 1995), 160 p. (including 4 drawings and tables), 146 ills. between p. 128-129. — cf. an informative critical review by Richard Salomon, *JAOS*, CXVII, 2 (1997), p. 406-408. In this connection one may add a rich study published with extensive bibliographical remarks almost simultaneously by Richard Salomon, “An Inscribed Silver Buddhist Reliquary of the Time of King Kharoṣṭa and Prince Indravarman”, *JAOS*, CXVI, 3 (July-Sept. 1996), p. 418-452, including 23 figs.

ars have revealed for us rare materials for further studies.<sup>57</sup> The most welcome is their publications of the textual studies containing facsimiles of the hitherto unpublished Buddhist Sanskrit literature.<sup>58</sup>

★

Last but not the least, in connection with the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra* at issue, it is most interesting to learn of the existence of the manuscripts of this very literature in the Martin Schøyen Collection. I was thrilled to learn of it two years ago. It was announced by Professor Kazunobu Matsuda, who has really an extraordinary sharp nose to dig out unidentified Buddhist literature.<sup>59</sup> Every serious scholar without exception in the related fields of study must be amazed at the news and eager to learn more. Let us therefore hope to see these materials published as soon as possible! They will no doubt shed light on various unsolved problems.<sup>60</sup>

＜日本私立学校振興・共済事業団 平成 12 年度学術研究振興資金による成果の一部＞

<sup>57</sup> Cf. e.g. G. M. Bongard-Levin and M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, *Indian Texts from Central Asia (Leningrad Manuscript Collection)*. With a Foreword by Akira Yuyama (= *Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica: Series Minor*, V) (Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1986), v, 56 p.

<sup>58</sup> See among others e.g. *Pamjatniki indijskoj pis'mennosti iz Cwntal'noj Azii*. Vypusk I: Izdanie tekstov, issledovanie i kommentarij G. M. Bongard-Levina i M. I. Vorov'eboj-Desjatovskoj / Vypusk II: Izdanie tekstov, issledovanie, perevod i kommentarij G. M. Bongard-Levina i M. I. Vorov'eboj-Desjatovskoj (= *Pamjatniki pis'mennosti vostoka*, LXXIII, 1-2) (= *Biblioteka Buddhica*, XXXIII-XXXIV) (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo «Nauka» Glavnaja Redakcija Vostočnoj, 1985-1990), 285 p., including facsimiles on p. 177-285, 439 p., including facsimiles on p. 315-439.

<sup>59</sup> 松田和信, “シアトル、そして再びオスロとロンドンへ”, 佛教大学総合研究所報, No. 15 (December 1998), p. 14-16, including 3 photos. — on the Lotus Sutra see esp. p. 15b!

<sup>60</sup> Cf. also J. Braarvig, J.-U. Hartmann, K. Matsuda and L. Sander, “Reports from the Kyoto Seminar for the Buddhist Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, May 10-14, 1999”, *Newsletter/Research Institute of Bukkyo University*, No. 17 (December 1999), p. 10-15.

# *Aftermath Notes on Mannerheim's Travels 1906-1908*

(1) Footnote 7:- Barely in time I have just received a copy with much difficulty:

*C. G. Mannerheim in Central Asia 1906-1908*, edited by Petteri Koskikallio and Asko Lehmustallio (Helsinki: National Board of Antiquities, 1999), 128 p.

*This book is not an 'exhibition catalogue' as I expected, but was published in conjunction with the exhibition "Mannerheim in Central Asia 1906-1908" (19.V.1999-7.I.2001). On the copyright page is found the name of Pirjo Varjola as Chief Editor of the Exhibition Catalogue at the Museum of Cultures. Contrary to my anticipation, no Indic manuscript fragment is introduced in facsimile. However, it is full of invaluable photos taken by Mannerheim himself. A facsimile of his diary is found on p. 52.*

*The following articles are of direct interest to my present research work:*

Hedi Lahdentausta, Marjatta Parpola, Pilvi Vainonen, Asko Lehmustallio, "Mannerheim in Central Asia", p. 7-45:

*Page 20 "Tracking the Japanese" (in the Khotan region around November-December 1906): "Despite the rumours, there was no sign of Japanese agents in the area. Mannerheim returned to Kashgar for the New Year, and spent January 1907 making clean copies of his draft maps, developing his photographs and overhauling his equipment. He added to his collection of objects and sent what he had acquired so far by rail back to Finland." (p. 20b).*

*— Compare my description around notes 16 and 17 above!*

Harry Halén, "Baron Mannerheim's hunt for ancient Central Asian manuscripts", p. 47-51:

*Offering useful bibliographical notes on p. 51b.*

- - , "C. G. Mannerheims brev till senator Otto Donner", p. 53-61:

*Four letters from Mannheim to Professor Donner, a one-time President of the Finno-Ugrian Society, from Kashgar dated 7 January 1907, Kuldja (Kuča, 庫車 / 龜茲) 27 April 1907, Urumtschi (Urumchi) 4 August 1907, and from Lanchow (蘭州) on 17 February 1908.*

Pirjo Varjola, "Marshal Mannerheim's Central Asian collection in the Museum of Cultures", p. 63-76.

*An extensive bibliography is found on p. 76.*

(2) At the same time, to my pleasant surprise, I learned of a beautiful publication of 1000 photos taken by Mannerheim in the form of CD-ROM with necessary texts cited from his diary and interactive records of sounds on the background scenes. All my wanted photos are found therein:

*C. G. Mannerheim — Across Asia on Horseback 馬達漢* (Production Group: Sari Koskinen, multimedia designer; Outi Mansikkamäki, graphic designer; Johannes Raumonen, composer-dramatizer / Film Production: National Board of Antiquities (Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society, Mannerheim Foundation, Museum of Cultures, National Board of Antiquities, 2000).

*— On the name in Chinese 馬達漢 perfectly fit to Mannerheim's role a leaflet of the CD-ROM cites his words: "Pondering over the question of the name I was to bear, the Daotai of Kashgar seized a fine brush and added two beautiful characters after "Ma". I was now called Ma-da-han 'a horse who reaches the land of the Han-people, China'".*

(1 February 2001)